I have to turn the computer off to listen to anything over 13 MHz on the communications receiver less than 10 ft away! The 1930's AM-SW console in the living room still is slightly affected. I live two blocks from a Heinz Frozen Foods (Ore-Ida) plant and cold storage terminal as well as a substation! I have enough EMI and RFI even if you leave out chopped CB radios, thank you. And I listen to SW quite often; one of my favorites is R. Australia/ABC and I delight in finding English-based stations and rebroadcasters like R. Canada Int'l. or any remaining BBC feed.

Since these frequencies (2-30 MHz) aren't very far away from those used by police, fire and other emergency or aid groups in the low VHF range, I'm sure that one change in transmission characteristics will cause a caddywompus effect on nearby services. Simple, highly variable changes in modulation quality, amplitude, frequency and phasing are unpredictable to say the least when compared to telephone and cable linkage and look to be far worse than the skywave and troposcatter AM and television consumers are used to.

Furthermore, I use an antenna to receive FM and TV, not expensive cable TV. I am sure all the computer junk will gum up that.

You and everybody else already HEAVILY tax my phone service. Why in the world don't you use them to build the rural broadband services you wanted in the first place??? Isn't this just the usual, backward way you've done business since the Carter administration? INSTEAD OF JUST FINING POTTY-MOUTHED ANNOUNCERS, DO SOMETHING THAT DOESN'T DESTROY! THE MEDIA THEY CIRCULATE ON OR THE SYSTEMS THAT PROTECT THEM AND ALL OF US!